

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance are respectfully requested for claims 1-7 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claim 3 is amended to depend from claim 2 rather than claim 1, so as to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter appearing in claim 3.

The rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the proposed combination of Sanichi et al, US 2003/0119647 and Kawazu et al., US 5,976,678 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that “the visible light transmittance of the ceramic layer is 0.3% or lower and the ultraviolet light transmittance of the ceramic layer is 0.1% or lower.” Support for this amendment may be found in the originally-filed specification, for instance on page 3, in paragraph [0013].

As noted in the Office Action, the primary reference, Sanichi, fails to teach (i) the glass having a transmitted color of a^* of -10.0 to 0.0 in an $L^*a^*b^*$ color system; (ii) the ceramic layer having a reflected color of $L^* \leq 30.0$, $-10.0 \leq a^* \leq 0$, and $-2 \leq b^* \leq 8$ in an $L^*a^*b^*$ color system; and (iii) the ceramic containing a green-color pigment in an amount of 30-80wt% relative to 100wt% of a total of a black-color pigment and the green-color pigment.

The Office Action offers the Kawazu patent as making up for the failure of the Sanichi reference. These two references are remarkably different. So different, in fact, that it is not reasonable to suggest that the skilled artisan would have been motivated to try to combine them. Sanichi is directed to a glass having an opaque coating. In particular, the ceramic color layer of Sanichi is a non-transparent thick film. See, for instance, paragraph [0070] noting that the purpose of the ceramic color is to block sunlight. The color of this coating is commonly black. In contrast, Kawazu is directed to a colored film-covered glass that is transparent or semi-transparent - see column 3, lines 29-38 and the examples. Thus, not only does Kawazu differ in that it is directed to a colored glass, but the coating is very thin- 50nm-180nm according to column 2, line 7.

Based on these differences, the skilled artisan would have no reason to try to apply optical characteristics from the teachings of Kawazu with the glass of Sanichi. Indeed, if the skilled artisan, were, for some reason, to attempt such a combination, they would arrive at a transparent or semitransparent coating that would not render the presently claimed invention obvious.

Moreover, in Kawazu the coloring is achieved by fine gold particles (abstract). This coloring is fundamentally different from that of Sanichi and the claimed invention, in which coloring is achieved with an inorganic pigment in a ceramic color paste. Generally, metal particles (e.g., fine gold particles) would not function to color a ceramic color layer. Rather, metal particles are useful for their properties of metal reflection. Therefore, the skilled artisan would not reasonably expect to achieve the advantageous effects of a green-color pigment of the claimed invention upon mixing fine gold particles in a ceramic color paste.

The assertion in the Office Action that Sanichi teaches a composition having pigment in an amount of from 10 to 40 % cannot render obvious the element in the present claims which requires a green-color pigment in an amount of 30-80wt% relative to the combination of black-color pigment and the green-color pigment. More particularly, even assuming Sanichi could be relied on for the general proposition that the ratio of color pigment to total amount of the ceramic composition were important, this does not teach the skilled artisan that it would be result effective to adjust the ratio of green pigment to the overall content of black and green pigment in the composition. Simply put, these are distinct ratios. Even if the ratio of color pigment to the amount of ceramic composition were thought to be result-effective, it tells the skilled artisan nothing about whether the ratio of green to green and black together is similarly result effective.

Still further, the presently pending claims refer to the transmitted color of the glass and the reflected color of the ceramic color layer as observed from the exterior of the vehicle, i.e., the side of the glass opposite the ceramic color layer. This is evident from the claim language itself as well as paragraph [0014] of the

specification. In contrast, the Office Action cites portions of the Kawazu reference that reference the properties of light transmitted *through both* the glass and the coating. Examination of column 4 make clear that Kawazu refers to light transmitted to be light transmitted through the glass and the coating. In contrast, when Kawazu discusses light as observed from outside the motor vehicle, the light is deemed reflected, not transmitted, see column 5, lines 5-13. Still further, Kawazu does not call to the attention of the skilled artisan that the interaction of the transmitted color of the glass and the reflected color of a ceramic layer, as observed from a vehicle exterior, has any significance, as is required in the present claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the obviousness rejection cannot be properly maintained and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the proposed combination of Sanichi et al, US 2003/0119647, Kawazu et al., US 5,976,678 and Chiba, US 6,362,119, is respectfully traversed.

Chiba is offered as making up for the failure of Sanichi and Kawazu to teach or suggest the invention of claim 4, namely that the black-color pigment comprises a mixture of chromium oxide, copper oxide and manganese oxide. However, Chiba does not make up for the failure of the Sanichi and Kawazu references to obviate the invention of claim 1. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance, and prompt favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket No. 038788.57892US).

Respectfully submitted,

August 26, 2008

/Christopher T. McWhinney/
Christopher T. McWhinney
Registration No. 42,875

J. D. Evans
Registration No. 26,269

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
CTM